

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/804,074	Applicant(s) JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Mohammad A. Siddiqi	Art Unit 2154	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mohammad A. Siddiqi.

(3) Stephen Gigante.

(2) Nabil El-Hady.

(4) Al Blanchette.

Date of Interview: 06 December 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,17,23,41 and 53.

Identification of prior art discussed: 6,687,878.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant briefly persisted what he considered novelty of the invention as the rendering process is taking place in the server as apposed to prior art (Eintracht). Examiner persisted his interpretation to prior art (Eintracht) is using server for processing the rendering in one of the embodiment. Discussed limitations that are part of applicant's arguments but not included in the claims, and proposed to amend the claims to include these limitations and define clearly the novelty .